

PEARSON, J.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

MICHAEL PARIZEAU,)	
)	CASE NO. 5:16CV2945
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	JUDGE BENITA Y. PEARSON
)	
NANCY A. BERRYHILL,)	
ACTING COMMISSIONER OF)	
SOCIAL SECURITY,)	
)	<u>MEMORANDUM OF OPINION</u>
Defendant.)	<u>AND ORDER</u>

An Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) denied Plaintiff Michael Parizeau’s application for disability insurance benefits (“DIB”) after a hearing in the above-captioned case. That decision became the final determination of the Commissioner of Social Security when the Appeals Council denied the request to review the ALJ’s decision. The claimant sought judicial review of the Commissioner’s decision, and the Court referred the case to Magistrate Judge George J. Limbert for preparation of a report and recommendation pursuant to [28 U.S.C. § 636](#) and [Local Rule 72.2\(b\)\(1\)](#). On February 12, 2018, the magistrate judge submitted a Report ([ECF No. 16](#)) recommending that the Court affirm the Commissioner’s decision as supported by substantial evidence and made pursuant to proper legal standards. Specifically, the magistrate judge found Plaintiff’s argument that the ALJ erred in assigning little weight to the opinions of Dr. Bittance, Plaintiff’s treating physician, when determining Plaintiff’s residual functional capacity (“RFC”), is without merit. [ECF No. 16 at PageID #: 534](#). In addition the magistrate

(5:16CV2945)

judge found that the ALJ provided “good reasons” for assigning less than controlling weight to the opinions of Dr. Bittance regarding Plaintiff’s physical and mental limitations. [*Id.* at PageID#: 535—37](#). Next, the magistrate judge found the ALJ properly addressed the factors set forth in [20 C.F.R. § 404.1527](#), and therefore, did not violate the treating physician rule or any applicable regulation. [*Id.* at PageID#: 537](#). Finally, the magistrate judge found Plaintiff’s argument that the ALJ erred in failing to include any specific work-related limitations in the RFC analysis arising from Plaintiff’s right hand impairment, is also without merit. [*Id.* at PageID #: 537—38](#).

[Fed. R. Civ. P. 72\(b\)\(2\)](#) provides that objections to a report and recommendation must be filed within 14 days after service. Objections to the magistrate judge’s Report were, therefore, due on February 26, 2018. Neither party has filed objections, evidencing satisfaction with the magistrate judge’s recommendations. Any further review by this Court would be a duplicative and inefficient use of the Court’s limited resources. [Thomas v. Arn, 728 F.2d 813 \(6th Cir. 1984\)](#), *aff’d*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); [Howard v. Secretary of Health and Human Services, 932 F.2d 505 \(6th Cir. 1991\)](#); [United States v. Walters, 638 F.2d 947, 949-50 \(6th Cir. 1981\)](#).

Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation of the magistrate judge is hereby adopted. The decision of the Commissioner of Social Security is affirmed. Judgment will be entered in favor of Defendant.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

February 28, 2018
Date

/s/ Benita Y. Pearson
Benita Y. Pearson
United States District Judge